

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested. Claims 1-36 and 38 were previously canceled. In this response, claims 37, 46, 52 and 60 have been amended; and claims 64-73 are new. No new matter has been added.

SUMMARY OF THE OFFICE ACTION

Claims 37, 39, 42-46 and 48-53 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0169926 of Pinckney et al. ("Pinckney"). Claims 40 and 47 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable based on Pinckney. Claim 41 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable based on Pinckney in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,744,763 to Jones et al. (hereinafter, "Jones").

RESPONSE TO REJECTIONS

The present invention generally relates to a network cache that operates on a network in a client-server environment, to provide streaming media data to requesting clients. The network cache supports a plurality of streaming media protocols. As such, it includes a first subsystem to stream media data to a client, and this subsystem is dependent upon the streaming media protocol. The network cache also includes a second subsystem to store the streaming media data in (and read it from) a mass storage facility; however, this second subsystem operates in a manner that is independent of streaming media protocol. This allows storage and retrieval operations to be generalized and optimized, thus providing for more efficient data retrieval and

transmission of streaming media data in response to client requests. However, while this (second) subsystem operates in a protocol independent manner, it nonetheless stores streaming media data received from an origin server in a protocol-specific form, e.g., according to the protocol in which the data was received from the origin server. This eliminates the need for any translation of streaming media data into a uniform (canonical) form. To support multiple different streaming protocols, multiple instances of the same media stream can be stored in the cache, where each instance is stored in a different protocol-specific form.

Referring now to the claims, new claim 64 recites:

64. (New) A streaming media network cache comprising:
a storage facility to cache streaming media data received by the streaming media network cache from a remote server **in a form that is specific to a first streaming media protocol**;
a protocol independent caching subsystem **to store** the streaming media data in the storage facility **in said form that is specific to the first streaming media protocol** and to retrieve the streaming media data from the storage facility; and
a protocol dependent caching subsystem to output the streaming media data retrieved by the protocol independent caching subsystem from the storage facility to a client system over a network according to the first streaming media protocol. (Emphasis added.)

Pinckney does not disclose or suggest such an apparatus, and in particular, one in which streaming media data received from a remote server is stored in a form that is specific to a particular streaming media protocol (e.g., the “first streaming media protocol” in claim 64) by a protocol independent caching subsystem.

Pinckney discloses that streaming media content is translated by a protocol translator 36 and then stored in a protocol-independent (canonical) form (para. [0032]). The content is then translated back into a protocol-specific form by a protocol translator

38 before the content is sent to a client. This is contrary to the present invention, in which the streaming media is stored in a form that is *specific* to a *particular* streaming media protocol. A significant advantage of the present invention is that it avoids the need for any protocol translation of the sort disclosed in Pinckney (i.e., into canonical form), which tends to be CPU intensive.

For at least the above reasons, claim 64 and all claims which depend on it are believed to be patentable over the cited art.

Independent claims 37, 46, 52 and 60 have been amended to include limitations similar to those discussed above and, therefore, they are believed to be patentable over the cited art along with their dependent claims, for similar reasons.

DEPENDENT CLAIMS

In view of the above remarks, a specific discussion of the dependent claims is considered to be unnecessary. Therefore, Applicants' silence regarding any dependent claim is not to be interpreted as agreement with, or acquiescence to, the rejection of such claim or as waiving any argument regarding that claim.


CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly requested.

If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: 2/15/2007



Jordan M. Becker
Reg/No. 39,602

Customer No. 48102
12400 Wilshire Blvd.
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300